



Electronic 901 Working Group Minutes

Date: Tuesday, March 29, 2005
Time: 1:00–3:00 p.m.
Location: Rockledge 1, 5th Floor, Room 5147
Advocate: Ellen Liberman

Next Meeting: Tuesday, April 12, 2005. Location RKL 1, Room 2198

Change Request Prototype Page: <http://erawebdev.od.nih.gov/UI/e901/index.asp>

Action Items

1. (Daniel Fox) Lana to investigate if Type 8 is needed as part of validation for Type Code entry.
2. (Daniel Fox) Add a *View Comments* link on the Manage Requests Screen.
3. (Daniel Fox) Make the Suffix Code Field Validation of Grant Number go to S9.
4. (Daniel Fox) Verify that Type 4 applications are allowed to be in Fast Track for small business.
5. (Daniel Fox) Amend the conditions and error messages on the 1.1.3.2 *Other Grant Number Validation* according to group suggestions.

Handouts

1. Who can Change Request Data after Request has been Initiated?
[http://era.nih.gov/docs/Who can change Request Data after Request has been initiat....pdf](http://era.nih.gov/docs/Who%20can%20change%20Request%20Data%20after%20Request%20has%20been%20initiat....pdf)
2. 1.1 Track Requests – Who can Move Requests to *My Queue*?
[http://era.nih.gov/docs/Who Can Move Requests to My Queue.pdf](http://era.nih.gov/docs/Who%20Can%20Move%20Requests%20to%20My%20Queue.pdf)
3. 1.1 Assignment Change Request – Validation
[http://era.nih.gov/docs/Assignment Change Request Business Rules.pdf](http://era.nih.gov/docs/Assignment%20Change%20Request%20Business%20Rules.pdf)
4. Appendix A Error Text
[http://era.nih.gov/docs/Appendix A Error Text.pdf](http://era.nih.gov/docs/Appendix%20A%20Error%20Text.pdf)

Type 8 or Type 3 vs. Only Types 1, 2, 4, and 9

Daniel Fox began the meeting by asking whether Type 8 and Type 3 applications both need to be present on the online 901 Request form. There is a discrepancy because some forms regarding the 901 process state that these two Types are allowed, while other documents maintain that only Types 1, 2, 4, and 9 are acceptable. The group was reminded that a Type 3 supplies an amendment to a supplement and vice versa, while a Type 8 is a non-competing application

dealing with the change of an institute or division. Since the Type 8 is non-competing, it is not included on a 901 request form; however, a Type 3 application is needed. Lana will investigate if Type 8 is in fact needed and get back to the group.

Revisit Checkbox for “Generate New Grant Number”

At a previous meeting, the group had agreed on a checkbox, available only to Department of Receipt and Referral (DRR) users, to generate new Grant Numbers. Daniel wanted to clarify the validations behind this checkbox. The group stated that sometimes a user wants to change these numbers, while there are other times that require the generation of the next number in the series. If there is a mistake in the system and a new number is needed, then this checkbox performs this action and is thus needed on the request form. This box will remain as a specific option for the DRR Chief, while other actors such as the Referral Liaison (RL) will be able to make a suggestion or recommendation for a change. Clicking on the checkbox generates a new Serial Number, while the Support Number and Activity Code stay the same.

Review – Who can edit data after Submission?

Daniel reminded the group that once the request is submitted, the reviewer can come in and access the Edit Request Data option. He then asked the group who, within the set of roles, can change or edit the requests at this stage. Is it necessary to limit this option by specific roles or can there be a general rule that applies to every request type? The group agreed to utilize the list Daniel provided and came up with the following list of roles that can *always* edit requests at the post-submission level:

1. *Grant # (Including IC) Change:* DRR Chief / RL
2. *Grant # (Excluding IC) Change:* Integrated Review Group (IRG) Chief / DRR Chief / RL
3. *Dual IC Change:* DRR Chief
4. *Grant # (Including IC) Change:* DRR Chief / RL
5. *Grant # (Excluding IC) Change:* IRG Chief / DRR Chief / RL
6. *Council Change:* IRG Chief / DRR Chief / RL
7. *Mass Council:* IRG Chief / DRR Chief / RL
8. *IRG Change(meaning ANY review change):* IRG Chief / DRR Chief / RL
9. *IRG (meaning ANY review change) / Dual IC Change:* IRG Chief / DRR Chief / RL

Review – Who can move requests to *My Queue*?

Daniel called the group’s attention to a handout he supplied, showing Request Types and the corresponding User Roles authorized to move the requests to *My Queue*. He wanted to know whether the two comprehensive rules at the top of this handout were enough to define the request move or if the group needed to go through the list and specifically identify roles. The group

agreed that the first two rules apply to the entire process and that further inspection and definition on the provided table was not necessary.

Daniel then refreshed the group on the exact functions of the buttons on the *Manage Request* web page. These definitions were covered at the last meeting held on 03/15/2005 (http://era.nih.gov/docs/901_Minutes_03-15-05_FINAL.pdf).

Q. Who can perform the Terminate function?

A. Only the IRG Chief, the DRR Chief, and the RL can perform a Termination. Recalls, on the other hand, can be done by anyone.

The previous person in the chain will be notified that his or her request has been terminated. Also, the user executing the termination will be given a warning message making sure that this is the option he or she meant to do.

Because of space limitations, Daniel thinks that there would be no way to access Comments (i.e., the user's way of expressing action justification, or why he or she performed a certain action) on the *Manage Request* page. However, he will put a *View Comments* link where users will be able to see comments of a separate page. This will be blank unless there are comments populating it..

Action: (Daniel Fox) Add a *View Comments* link on the *Manage Request* page.

Daniel assured the group that they will speak more about notifications at a later date and that they will be able to play with and edit this site.

Review Validation Rules for Grant Number, Duals, Council Date, and Dual Council Date

Daniel went over the general rules at the top of the document entitled *1.1 Assignment Change Request – Validation*. This basically goes over the errors and warnings that users will receive while utilizing the online change request system. He stated that the confirmation page will be shown at every step of the way. On this document, the group noticed that the Suffix Codes only go up to S3, when they should go up to S9.

Action: (Daniel Fox) Make the Field Validation of Grant Numbers' Suffix Code go to S9.

Daniel showed the group the *Get Prior Grant* section of the 1.1 handout which first dealt with *Council Date Validation*. He said it was his personal mission to get all IMPAC II applications to go forward in Council Date. The group went over the five conditions for validation and members confirmed that every condition was acceptable, except Condition 2: Council Date in YYYYMM format, which will be removed from the condition list. Dual Council Date is basically the same while Dual IC validation does not need a specific justification.

In section 1.1.3.1, the group looked at *Field Validation of the Grant Number*. The group approved the Conditions and Error / Warning messages within the table for the following Fields: Type, Activity Code, IC, Support Year, and Serial Number. When speaking about Suffix Codes, the group agreed that for every supplement there can be an amendment.

Group members then turned their attention to section 1.1.3.2 *Other Grant Number Validation*, where they made the following additions and amendments to the supplied table:

1. Condition: OK

Error 3007: (*change to*) The grant # you requested is already assigned.

2. – 5. (Since these deal with Type 8 applications, the group agreed to come back to them.)

6. Condition: The group mentioned that this might be an error, since Type 4s might be allowed to be in the Fast Track, small business series. Daniel will look into that issue

Action: (Daniel Fox) Verify that Type 4 applications are allowed to be in Fast Track for small business.

7. Condition: Change “form” to “from.”

Error 30128: There is a discrepancy between the rule on this list and the message on the list of Error / Warning text. (*change to*) Type 9 can change to any other Type than Type 8.

7a. New Error Message: If changing Type 1 to a Type 9, then error 30128 will apply.

8. Condition: OK

Error: Remove this error.

9. Condition: OK

Error 30001: (*change to*) The IC entered does not support this specified activity code.

10. Condition: OK

Error 30002: (*change to*) The support year is incorrect.

11. Condition: OK

Error 30003: (*change to*) The suffix code is incorrect.

12. Condition: OK

Warning 10214: (*change to*) Amendment beyond A2. Acceptable?

13. Condition: OK

Error 30003: OK

14. Condition: OK

Error 00118: (*change to*) The Suffix code cannot be blank

15. Condition: OK

Error 00116: (*change to*) Amendments or supplements are not allowed

16. Condition: OK

Error 10230: (*change to*) The support year entered is the same as prior record. You need to enter DIFFICULT support year for this Grant #.

17. Condition: OK (When entering data for applications, there is a difference between fellowships, small businesses, and everything else. There is no swapping between these options.)

Error 30005: Daniel will work independently on creating this error message.

18. Condition: OK

Error 3005: Whatever this message ends up being, it will split into two messages for this number and for number 17.

19. Condition: OK

Error 30151: OK

20. Condition: OK

Error30012: OK

21. Condition: OK

Error 30009: This error code is incorrect – they will change this to a new error code. Everything needs to be entered except for the cereal number. (There are times when an amendment suffix is the only thing that needs to be manipulated. The only element that is changing is the suffix code.)

22. Condition: OK

Algorithms (section 1.1.3.3): These algorithms apply to multiple errors (specifically Error 00105 and Error 00267). Daniel will take these algorithms offline and work on them, specifically the *Get Prior Grant Algorithm*, which is a questionable rule having to do with Phase 1 and Phase 2.

Action: (Daniel Fox) Amend the conditions and error messages on the 1.1.3.2 Other Grant Number Validation according to group suggestions.

The group agreed to stop at this point and finish discussion of this at the next meeting on April 12. Lana reminded everyone that these meetings take place bi-weekly now. Daniel suggested a meeting with Suzanne Fisher and anyone else who would like to attend to continue talking about these issues. That meeting will take place on Friday, April 8 at 10:30 am.

Attendees

Diggs, Lana	Edwards, Michael	Fisher, Suzanne	Fox, Daniel
Hagan, Ann	Liberman, Ellen	Noronha, Jean	Paugh, Steven
Roberts, Luci	Stesney, Jo Ann		